Diamond Williams

090245-T

From:

Pam Keillor [pkeillor@radeylaw.com]

Sent:

Friday, June 11, 2010 4:41 PM

To:

Filings@psc.state.fl.us

Cc:

Catherine Beard; Curtis Williams; Kevin Cox; Mitchell Brecher; Lee Eng Tan

Subject:

Electronic Filing - Virgin Mobile's Request for Oral Argument

Attachments: 2010-06-11 Virgin Mobile Request for Oral Argument.pdf

Electronic Filing

Person responsible for this electronic filing:

Susan F. Clark Radey Thomas Yon & Clark, P.A. 301 South Bronough Street, Suite 200 Tallahassee, Florida 32301 (850) 425-6654 sclark@radeylaw.com

- b. Docket No. 090245-TP In re: Petition for limited designation as eligible telecommunications carrier (ETC) by Virgin Mobile USA, L.P.
- Document being filed on behalf of Virgin Mobile USA, L.P.
- d. There are 4 pages.
- The document attached for electronic filing is Virgin Mobile USA, L.P.'s Request for Oral Argument on Its Motion to Dismiss with Prejudice Organize Now's, Lloyd Moore's and Gracie Fowler's Petition for Formal Proceeding

(See attached file: 2010-06-11 Virgin Mobile Request for Oral Argument)

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Pam L. Keillor Assistant to Susan F. Clark and Travis L. Miller Radey Thomas Yon & Clark, P.A. Post Office Box 10967 (32302) 301 South Bronough Street, Suite 200 Tallahassee, Florida 32301 (850) 425-6654 Main (850) 425-6663 Direct (850) 425-6694 Fax Email: pkeillor@radeylaw.com

This e-mail, and any attachments thereto, is intended only for use by the addressee(s) named herein and may contain legally privileged and/or confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this e-mail, and any attachments thereto, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify me by replying to this message and permanently delete the original and any copy of this e-mail and any printout thereof. COCHMENT NEMBER CALL

34867 JUNII 2

Before the FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Petition for limited designation as)	DOCKET NO. 090245-TP
eligible telecommunications carrier (ETC))	
by Virgin Mobile USA, L.P.)	FILED: June 11, 2010
)	

VIRGIN MOBILE USA, L.P.'S REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT ON ITS MOTION TO DISMISS WITH PREJUDICE ORGANIZE NOW'S, LLOYD MOORE'S AND GRACIE FOWLER'S PETITION FOR FORMAL PROCEEDING

Pursuant to Rule 25-22.0022, Florida Administrative Code, Virgin Mobile USA, L.P. ("Virgin Mobile") hereby requests oral argument on its Motion To Dismiss With Prejudice Organize Now's, Lloyd Moore's, and Gracie Fowler's Petition For Formal Proceeding ("Motion"). Oral argument will aid in the Commission's understanding and evaluation of the issues to be decided as follows:

1. The Petition for Formal Proceeding filed by Organize Now demonstrates a fundamental misunderstanding of Universal Service law, specifically as to the services that must be part of a qualifying Lifeline package and how that relates to the Commission's granting of an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier ("ETC") designation. Lifeline services are established by the Federal Communications Commission ("FCC") in conjunction with the Federal-State Board on Universal Service in a process set forth in the federal Communications Act of 1934 and related FCC regulations. To the extent the Commission would find it useful, oral argument would allow Virgin Mobile to further explain and respond to questions from the Commission about the interaction of these laws and how the standard for granting a Motion To Dismiss has been met.¹

¹ See In re: Notice of adoption of existing interconnection agreement between BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. d/b/a AT&T Florida d/b/a AT&T Southeast and Sprint Communications Company Limited Partnership, Sprint Communications Company L.P., Sprint Spectrum L.P., by NPCR, Inc. d/b/a Nextel Partners, Docket No. 070368-TP; Order No. PSC-08-0415-FOF-TP; 2008 Fla. PUC Lexis 248 at *8, 08 FPSC 6:115 (June 23, 2008) (granting

- 2. The Petition calls into question the value provided by Virgin Mobile's Assurance Lifeline program and disingenuously attacks Virgin Mobile's use of the word "free" to describe Lifeline services that are truly free to the consumer. Only Virgin Mobile can best describe its Lifeline package and its business practices. Even taking all allegations in the Petition as true for purposes of the Motion, a clear understanding of Virgin Mobile's services and business practices could aid in the Commission's evaluation and resolution of the Motion. Moreover, as the questions the Commission may have about Virgin Mobile's business cannot be predicted in advance and addressed in writing, oral argument will aid the Commission.
- 3. The Petitioners' alleged grounds for standing to maintain a formal proceeding before the Commission are novel and specious. They describe the "injury" they will suffer if Virgin Mobile is granted an ETC designation by suggesting they would be better off if Virgin's Lifeline program contained different terms. This is of course no "injury" at all. Because the Petitioners have attempted to sidetrack extensive Florida jurisprudence on individual and associational standing by describing how their "substantial interests" are affected in a confusing and unorthodox manner, oral argument by counsel will aid the Commission's understanding and resolution of this issue.
- 4. While the purported purpose of the Petition is relief from the "onerous terms" of Virgin Mobile's Lifeline program, the frivolous nature and facial deficiencies of the Petition suggest that the underlying purpose of the Petition is only to prevent or delay *Virgin Mobile specifically* from obtaining ETC designation, a designation that is urgently needed and that will unequivocally benefit Florida consumers. Oral argument by counsel will aid the Commission's

request for oral argument that would aid the Commission in "understanding and evaluating the legal bases" of the relief sought).

understanding and evaluation of this issue so that a timely resolution of the case is achieved.

Delay only serves the competitive interests of other carriers, not Florida Lifeline customers.

WHEREFORE, Virgin Mobile requests oral argument of fifteen (15) minutes per side on its Motion at the Commission's convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

s/ Susan F. Clark

Susan F. Clark, Florida Bar No. 179580
Elizabeth McArthur, Florida Bar No. 354491
RADEY THOMAS YON & CLARK, P.A.
301 S. Bronough Street, Suite 200
Tallahassee, Florida 32399
(850) 425-6654 Telephone
(850) 425-6694 Facsimile
sclark@radeylaw.com
emcarthur@radeylaw.com

Peter Lurie
Elaine Divelbliss
Virgin Mobile USA, L.P.
10 Independence Blvd.
Warren, NJ 07059
(908) 607-4017 Telephone
(908) 607-4078 Facsimile
plurie@virginmobileusa.com
elaine.divelbliss@virginmobileusa.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that a copy of the foregoing has been furnished by U.S. Mail or electronically to the parties listed below this 11th day of June, 2010.

Theresa Tan
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850
LTan@psc.state.fl.us

Gracie Fowler 2125 Stanley Street Orlando, FL 32803

Catherine Beard Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850 CBeard@psc.state.fl.us

D. Bruce May/Kevin W. Cox Holland & Knight LLP P.O. Drawer 810 Tallahassee, FL 32302 kevin.cox@hklaw.com

Curtis Williams
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850
cjwillia@psc.state.fl.us

Lloyd Moore P.O. Box 618607 Orlando, FL 32861

Mitchell F. Brecher Greenberg Traurig, LLP 2101 L Street N.W., Suite 1000 Washington, D.C. 20037 <u>brecherm@gtlaw.com</u>

Organize Now 231 East Colonial Drive Orlando, FL 32801

Sheila Stickel Advocates for Universal Access P.O. Box 21914 Seattle, WA 98111

s/ Susan F. Clark
Susan F. Clark